

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action dated June 23, 2010. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the Application. Claims 1 and 8 are independent claims. Claims 3 and 13 are canceled herein, without prejudice. The Applicants respectfully reserve the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein, either at a later time during the prosecution of this application or any continuing applications.

In the Office Action, claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description. The rejection of claim 13 is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the specification, such as FIG. 6 provides ample support for this claim recitation. However, in the interest of advancing consideration and allowance of the claims, the Applicants have elected to cancel claim 13 as indicated above rendering this rejection of claim 13 moot.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0197472 to Kanauchi et al. ("Kanauchi") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0196241 to Morita ("Morita") and further, in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0033278 to Ohta ("Ohta"). These rejections are respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-12 are allowable over Kanauchi, Morita, and Ohta for at least the following reasons.

It is undisputed that Kanauchi does not teach "the at least two displayed bands of

simultaneously illuminated rows of pixels scrolling in the column direction over time such that the at least two displayed bands of simultaneously illuminated rows of pixels simultaneously change horizontal position from one time to a next time ..." (See, last full paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action). It is further undisputed that Kanauchi and Morita do not teach "at least two displayed bands of simultaneously illuminated rows of pixels" (See, page 4, lined 8-9 of the Office Action). Therefore, the Office Action relies on Ohta, paragraphs [0105] and [0106] to teach that which is admitted missing from Kanauchi and Morita.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify its recitations. In particular, claim 1 recites "displaying image data for different frames of video in different ones of the at least two displayed bands of simultaneously illuminated rows of pixels, so that different parts of two adjacent frames are displayed simultaneously at any one time". Support for this is found at penultimate paragraph of page 5 of the specification as well as in claim 3, which is now canceled.

The referenced paragraphs Ohta describe outputting display data signals based on the display data to data signal lines so as to display an image according to the display data, in paragraph [0105], and that the image display device includes a data signal line driving section for outputting display data signals (e.g., video signals) based on the display data respectively to data signal lines, so as to display an image according to the display data, in paragraph [0106]. These descriptions and the rest of Ohta do not teach, disclose, or suggest "displaying image data for different frames of video in different ones of the at least two displayed bands", which was formerly set out in claim 3 and is now recited in claim 1.

A close review of paragraphs [0078]-[0079] used to reject claim 3 and the rest of

Kanauchi reveal that the term "frame" is used in Kanauchi to indicate a time period not a portion of a video stream as in claim 1. While the referenced paragraphs describe an image displayed on the display region 1 based on the video signal (d), in paragraph [0078] and "when the region of a display 2 is scanned, the image based on the video signal (d) is displayed on the display region 2", in paragraph [0079], these descriptions and the rest of Kanauchi do not teach, disclose, or suggest "displaying image data for different frames of video in different ones of the at least two displayed bands", which was formerly set out in claim 3 and is now recited in claim 1.

Similarly, support for claims 9, 10, 11, and 12 is found in the paragraph spanning pages 5 and 6 of the specification. These claims are rejected in the Office Action in view of discussion of Figure 13 in Kanauchi. Paragraph [0042] of Kanauchi describes Figure 13 as a timing chart explaining operation for inserting a scan side preparation frame performed when the partial display is executed by the second embodiment of Kanauchi. Paragraph [0073] describes Figure 13 shows the output timings of signals when a preparation frame is inserted and writing black data to the capacitors constituting respective pixels over the frame or the sub-frame. Paragraph [0076] describes the output timings of respective signals starting a partial display in the next frame (Figure 14). The referenced paragraphs and the rest of Kanauchi does not teach, disclose, or suggest the frame buffer that "stores partial image data for two adjacent frames, and wherein data is read out from the frame buffer at two locations simultaneously", as recited in claim 11.

It is respectfully submitted that the method of claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Kanauchi in view of Morita and Ohta. For example, Kanauchi

in view of Morita and Ohta does not teach, disclose or suggest, a method that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis added) "displaying image data for different frames of video in different ones of the at least two displayed bands of simultaneously illuminated rows of pixels, so that different parts of two adjacent frames are displayed simultaneously at any one time, wherein at most 75% of the rows of pixels are illuminated at any point in time" as recited in claim and as substantially recited in claim 8.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Kanauchi in view of Morita and Ohta and an indication to that effect is respectfully requested. Claims 2-7 and 9-12 respectively depend from one of claims 1 and 8 and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position, or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
September 16, 2010

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101